

## ***REMARKS***

### **Claim Objections:**

Claim objections have been obviated by the present amendments and cancellations.

### **35 U.S.C. § 112**

§112 rejections have been obviated by the present amendments and cancellations.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 23 through 41 have been cancelled.

Claim 42, as amended is allowable over the Streel reference. The amendments are supported by Figures 1 through 7 and the accompanying text. Streel does not disclose two different heights, each of which being at a different radial distance from the post as claimed and also each height being maintained through two different radial directions. In Streel, if the “grooves” 8 are read to be a different height than the top and bottom surfaces surrounding them (which is traversed, but addressed for the sake of argument herein) then the second height of grooves 8 is not maintained at the same radial distance from the post in at least two different directions radial from said post. Because the grooves 8 are each straight, as the radial direction around the post changes, the radial distance of grooves 8 changes. Accordingly, claim 42 as amended does not read on the Streel reference.

Neither is the amended claim 42 disclosed in any individual reference or rendered obvious by any combination of the references of record. The Kurpis reference does not disclose or suggest a base that is substantially orthogonal to the post in at least two directions (and in fact

teaches away from it). Figure 5 of Kurpis does not reveal a base that is substantially planar, as well as not revealing other recited claim limitations. For the same reason, the Grafelmann reference does not reveal a base that is orthogonal to its post in at least two orthogonal directions. The Karmaker reference does not reveal a base of any type.

Claims 44 through 57 represent some of the cancelled claims 26 through 41. Claim 44 repeats the claim to periodic alteration. The Streel reference does not suggest or motivate periodic height alteration because two grooves do not constitute periodic height variation. The same is true for the corrugations in claim 45. The sharp edge claimed in claim 46 corresponds to Figures 4 and 7 of the original application. The angles of the Streel reference nowhere disclose a sharp edge, all such edges being greater than ninety degrees. Claim 47 modifies the two radial directions limitation of claim 42 to claim a spiral; the references do not disclose a spiral.

#### **New Claims:**

Claims 58 through 66 are supported by Figures 8, 9 and 10 in the original application and the accompanying text on page 9. These claims are allowable as stated because their limitations are not disclosed, suggested or motivated in any prior art reference of record, or a combination thereof.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims are allowable over the prior art of record, including the cited references. For similar reasons, and for the additional reasons set forth above, Applicant urge that the dependent claims are also allowable.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

By: Robert C. Haldiman, Reg. No. 45,437  
Husch & Eppenberger, LLC  
190 Carondelet Plaza  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
314-480-1641  
314-480-1505 FAX